United Nations A/C.1/61/PV.10

General Assembly

Sixty-first session

Official Records

First Committee

10th meeting

Tuesday, 10 October 2006, 3 p.m.

New York

President: Mrs. Juul ..... (Norway)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

Thematic discussion on item subjects and introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This afternoon, we shall continue our thematic discussion on the issue of nuclear weapons.

Ms. Fernandez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba believes that the use of nuclear weapons is illegal and entirely immoral, and that it cannot be justified by any security concept or doctrine. Cuba continues firmly to support the total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons in particular. Like other members of the Non-Aligned Movement, Cuba has always made nuclear disarmament an absolute priority.

In spite of the end of the cold war, more than 27,000 nuclear weapons remain in the world, 12,000 of which are ready for immediate use. The use of those weapons would have devastating consequences for all known forms of life on Earth. Moreover, their use would represent a flagrant violation of international norms pertaining to the prevention of genocide. Moreover, new and more sophisticated nuclear weapons continue to be developed, posing a serious threat to all of humanity. The existence of strategic defence doctrines that depend increasingly on the possession and use of such weapons also represents a danger to international peace and security.

The belief that security can be guaranteed only by possessing nuclear weapons is totally false. To achieve State security by threatening mass destruction is to corrupt the principles underlying the most basic norms of human coexistence. The continued possession of nuclear weapons serves as an irresponsible incentive for proliferation, which increases the nuclear danger throughout the world.

The lack of progress in fulfilling the unequivocal commitment to total elimination of nuclear weapons undertaken by the nuclear Powers at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is unacceptable. The commitments already made — including the 13 practical steps agreed at the Sixth NPT Review Conference, held in 2000 — must be fully honoured.

At the Seventh NPT Review Conference, it became obvious that some nuclear Powers still lack the political will needed to attain the objective of eliminating and prohibiting nuclear weapons once and for all. I must reiterate that for Cuba, the NPT is not an end in itself, but a step on the road towards nuclear disarmament.

Once again, Cuba firmly expresses its rejection of the selective application of the NPT and the use of a double standard in that regard. Likewise, we stress that the issues related to nuclear disarmament and the

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

06-56241 (E)

peaceful use of nuclear energy cannot continue to be set aside to focus on horizontal non-proliferation.

We cannot continue to postpone the launching of multilateral negotiations to conclude a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument, whereby the nuclear-weapon States would promise not to use or threaten to use such weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

Nuclear weapons and their technical infrastructure are extremely expensive. The nuclear weapons industry involves a useless diversion of resources that could be used in valuable programmes such as development assistance. The implementation of such programmes would enable us to make genuine contributions to international peace and security.

Once again, Cuba recalls that the Charter of the United Nations envisages the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least possible diversion of the world's human and economic resources towards armaments. Cuba highlights the imperative need to launch multilateral negotiations aimed at the swift conclusion of a convention prohibiting the development, production, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat and use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.

We reaffirm our total commitment to a world free from nuclear weapons and our resolve to fight to make that aspiration a reality for all of humanity.

Ms. Fedorovich (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The position of Belarus on the issue of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation was clearly expressed in the statement made by my delegation during the general debate. We believe that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) must be strengthened and that it must remain the basis for international security.

While the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is undoubtedly important, today I should like to discuss the signing of the Treaty on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. I wish to draw the Committee's attention to the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belarus in his capacity as Chairman of the Council of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States members of the Collective Security Treaty Organization, the full text of which was circulated as a document of the Security Council (S/2006/766, annex). The statement points out that the signing of the Treaty on the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in Central Asia is a significant contribution to ensuring global and regional security and nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. That is particularly relevant in the context of the global campaign to fight terrorism and to prevent the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists. The signing of the Treaty will certainly also help to strengthen the NPT and provide impetus for United Nations efforts to address all issues related to nuclear non-proliferation.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): Allow me to reiterate the point that was highlighted by my delegation in its statement during the general debate of the Committee last week: we believe in the need to abolish all nuclear weapons and will work to that end with the international community. We believe that nuclear weapons are dangerous in anyone's hands, including those of nuclear-weapon States. In addressing the issue of nuclear weapons, we should never lose sight of the catastrophic danger associated with such weapons, which could result from accidents or miscalculations.

We therefore support the call of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission and share the belief that existing stocks of such weapons should be outlawed and eliminated in a systematic and progressive manner. Rhetoric alone will not suffice to address this issue. The nuclear-weapon States have a moral obligation to move away from nuclear weapons. That should start with the States holding the largest arsenals of nuclear weapons, namely, the United States and Russia. Their strong commitment and leadership are important, and they should demonstrate such commitment and leadership by setting an example.

We look forward to the commencement of a new cycle in the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) next year. In the preparation for the 2010 Review Conference and in response to the impasse that has prevailed since the last Review Conference, there is an urgent need to strengthen the integrity of the NPT.

In our common efforts to pursue the objectives of disarmament and non-proliferation, the States parties need to demonstrate the maximum flexibility and sufficient political will to bridge the gap and create common ground for reaching consensus and agreement on both procedural and substantive issues. Secondly,

States parties need to respect the existing obligations and commitments under the NPT and the agreements reached at previous Review Conferences, rather than intensifying measures using mechanisms outside the NPT regime.

Having said that, I now wish to comment on the recent nuclear test conducted by the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. We reiterate our position that it was unacceptable and cannot be justified.

The nuclear test conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will only create new tension and threaten stability in the Asia-Pacific region. The test could also trigger nuclear proliferation in the region and impede efforts by the international community to undertake comprehensive nuclear disarmament in accordance with the NPT.

We are of the view that no country's security and survival warrant the possession and development of nuclear weapons. We are also deeply concerned about the prospect of nuclear proliferation in Asia — which stretches from West Asia to East Asia — particularly when the problems related to proliferation issues have eased in other regions.

We strongly urge the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to refrain from developing nuclear weapons in the aftermath of its recent test. We also urge all parties concerned to resume the Six-Party Talks in order to seek a peaceful resolution of the North Korean nuclear issue.

Mr. Prasad (India). Before making my statement in today's thematic debate, I would like to share with First Committee delegations that India has expressed its deep concern at the reported nuclear test conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in violation of its international commitments, thereby jeopardizing peace, security and stability on the Korean peninsula and in the region. The test also highlights the dangers of clandestine proliferation.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2) constitutes the basic terms of reference of any discussion on nuclear disarmament. The special session unanimously accorded the highest priority to the goal of nuclear disarmament. It outlined concrete steps to achieve that objective. It affirmed that the ultimate goal was the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Some six years ago, the unanimously adopted United Nations Millennium Declaration (resolution 55/2) reiterated the commitment of the States Members of the United Nations to strive for the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and to keep all options open for achieving that aim.

The objective factors for the increasing militarization of international relations, a feature of the cold war years, no longer exist. Yet, we are quite far from realizing the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

A basic problem besetting the multilateral disarmament institutions and processes is the lack of trust among States. This further begets a lack of willingness for mutual accommodation, making progress on nuclear disarmament even more difficult. This lack of trust also thwarted consensus on disarmament and non-proliferation issues at the 2005 World Summit. For any breakthrough to occur, all States will need to engage sincerely in exchanges on their approaches to nuclear disarmament and understand and accommodate each other's threat perceptions and security concerns.

Trust can be restored only through a reaffirmation of the unequivocal commitment of all nuclear-weapon States to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. A revalidation of this commitment will be a further step towards its progressive concretization. That is the right way to proceed towards systematic and progressive nuclear disarmament. The process will also be facilitated by reducing the salience of nuclear weapons in the security doctrines of nuclear-weapon States, and also by the alignment of nuclear doctrines to a posture of no first use and non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

While India will continue to maintain a credible minimum deterrent, there is no dilution in India's commitment to nuclear disarmament. India's responsible doctrine is based on no first use and non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Our doctrine also reaffirms India's readiness to join multilateral negotiations for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. India has continued to observe a moratorium on nuclear explosive tests. We

are ready to participate in negotiations in the Conference of Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the proliferation of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

Any solution to end the impasse in the Conference on Disarmament on its programme of work must respond to the concerns of the constituents of the Conference, whether small or big, developing or developed, non-nuclear or nuclear-weapon States, within or outside alliances and other privileged security relationships.

Our considered proposals to build a consensus that strengthens the ability of the international community to initiate concrete steps towards achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament have been outlined in the working paper that we submitted in the course of the general debate last week. In order to save time, I am not now going to list its recommendations. The document should be made available by the Secretariat very shortly.

We live in a time of challenge; about that, there is no doubt. This challenge can be met only from a collective commitment to global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament and by devising a road map towards a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Mr. Luaces (United States of America): On 9 October, North Korea announced that it had tested a nuclear weapon. While our Government is still working to confirm the technical details of the explosion, North Korea's action is an urgent threat to peace, stability and security in the region and is a matter of grave concern to the entire international community.

The implications of this action by North Korea for international efforts to combat proliferation, international terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction could not be more profound or troubling. The test clearly demonstrates North Korea's continued reckless disregard for peace and security. The United States is consulting urgently with our partners, and within the Security Council, regarding appropriate responses to this grave provocation by North Korea.

Its continuing development of long-range missiles and nuclear weapons, as well as its increasing provocations, necessitate swift and stern measures by the international community. The North Korean regime remains one of the world's leading proliferators of missile technology, including to Iran and Syria. The transfer of nuclear weapons or nuclear material by North Korea to States or non-State entities would be considered a grave threat to the United States, and we would hold North Korea fully accountable for the consequences of such action.

The United States remains committed to diplomacy, and we shall continue to protect ourselves and our interests. President Bush has reaffirmed to our allies in the region that the United States will meet the full range of our deterrent and security commitments. It is critical that the international community work together to address North Korea's growing threats to its neighbours and to the world.

North Korea must be made to understand, in no uncertain terms, that we are serious in our resolve to deal with its dangerous and destabilizing behaviour. The international community must send a clear signal to North Korea that, if it chooses to continue its programmes of weapons of mass destruction and to develop their delivery vehicles, its reckless behaviour will only increase further its political and economic isolation. The leadership of North Korea must know that its misbehaviour only undermines its security and the welfare of the already suffering North Korean people.

The United States urges the international community to immediately, unequivocally and publicly denounce the North Korean action. Accordingly, we call on all Governments to take concrete defensive measures against North Korean and all other proliferation, including financial measures to freeze assets and transactions involving North Korean proliferation activities.

Mr. Landman (Netherlands): This week indeed has shown again that nuclear weapons in irresponsible hands are the single greatest threat to humanity. Conducting a nuclear test in present-day circumstances was a tremendous and deliberate provocation that has rightly been condemned by all sides. There is no justification for it, but we could ask ourselves what lesson should be drawn from this development. Any analysis could start with the words of last year's report to the Secretary-General by the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. It stated:

> "Many people believe that what passes for collective security today is simply a system for protecting the rich and powerful. Such perceptions pose a fundamental challenge to building collective security today. Stated baldly, without mutual recognition of threats there can be no collective security. Self-help will rule, mistrust will predominate and cooperation for long-term mutual gain will elude us." (*A/59/565, p. 16*)

A few days ago, we saw one of the worst examples of such self-help, and it is not unique. Analysts now point to what is sometimes called the danger of a cascade of proliferation. The United Nations report from which I have just quoted stresses that perceptions matter. Secretary-General Kofi Annan himself elaborated on this important issue in his report entitled, "In Larger Freedom", stating:

> "Depending on wealth, geography and power, we perceive different threats as the most pressing. But the truth is we cannot afford to choose. Collective security today depends on accepting that the threats which each region of the world perceives as most urgent are in fact equally so for all." (*A/59/2005, para. 79*)

Irresponsible behaviour cannot be eliminated from the world, but we must do out utmost to minimize it, in particular when weapons of mass destruction are involved. What actions can we take?

First, it is of vital importance to uphold the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). If its balanced commitments start to unravel, the level of global security will plummet. All elements of the NPT bargain are equally crucial. Proliferation in any form is unacceptable. Cooperation on the peaceful transfer of technology remains a confidence-building measure as well as an obligation, and nuclear-weapon States have to disarm. As Canadian Senator Douglas Roche of the Middle Powers Initiative has said, nuclear deterrence as a permanent policy is not morally acceptable.

Secondly, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) must enter into force. We need renewed vigour to that end, as it offers an essential safeguard against proliferation. The Netherlands will continue to support actively the Special Representative to promote the ratification process of the CTBT, Ambassador Jaap Ramaker.

Thirdly, a breakthrough in the Conference on Disarmament is now imperative. We must acknowledge that the numerous issues on its agenda require further prioritization, recognizing their relative weight as confirmed in the focused, structured debates held this year in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

Mr. Duarte (Brazil): Madam Chairperson, the Brazilian Government has vehemently condemned the nuclear test announced by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. That decision goes against the presidential declaration of the Security Council on the issue adopted on 6 October.

We call on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to return without any conditions and as a non-nuclear-weapon State to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We also call on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to become a party, at an early date, to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and to observe the test moratorium pending the entry into force of that Treaty. We also call on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to return in good faith to the six-party talks, with a view to reaching a solution to the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula and an understanding that takes into account the international security concerns of countries in the region.

Brazil associates itself once again with the efforts of the international community in favour of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and reiterates its view that significant and urgent steps should be taken with a view to the elimination of all atomic arsenals.

The Chairperson: There are no other delegations on the list for the general debate at this stage. Does any delegation wish to take the floor?

If not, the Committee will now proceed with the next segment of the meeting, during which delegations introduce draft resolutions.

Ms. Fernando (Sri Lanka): Madam Chairperson, I simply wanted to ask if you could confirm that the draft resolutions being introduced just now have been issued by the Secretariat as "L" documents. If not, when will they be available? I would not want to hold up the Committee's work, but traditionally we have had the documents before us as they are being introduced. Perhaps, in this new scenario, the Secretariat could let us know in advance which resolutions are being introduced, so that if the

documents have not yet been issued we could at least have some texts before us.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): As representatives know, the working methods of this Committee are well established. Traditionally — and this will be the case this year as well — the Committee moves to the thematic discussion and introduction of draft resolutions by Member States even if not all "L." documents have been issued.

The Committee last year adopted its programme of work and timetable for the current session. That timetable clearly indicates that the deadline for submitting all drafts is Wednesday, 11 October. The Secretariat has been pleased this year to receive a number of drafts from delegations well before the deadline, a fact that the Chairperson commended yesterday in her remarks to the Committee. On behalf of the Secretariat, I wish to express my gratitude to all delegations that have already submitted draft resolutions or decisions and to all those that are expected to follow suit.

The programme of work and timetable as it stands poses a practical problem, an issue, I understand, that was referred to by the representative of Sri Lanka. As we have done in years past, we begin the thematic debate and the introduction of draft resolutions even before the deadline for submitting the drafts. Under those circumstances, the Secretariat is in the hands of Member States. There is no guarantee that we will have issued limited distribution documents in all official languages at the start of the thematic debate. That is a factor in the programme of work as it now stands.

It is also the right of Member States to proceed in line with the standard practice of the Committee and the programme of work as adopted, and to introduce draft resolutions during the thematic debate. The thematic subjects, or clusters as we call them, are tools that are intended to make the Committee's work easier and more predictable. It is, of course, the right of any delegation to introduce any draft at any time during the thematic part of our work during this week and the next. We are grateful to Member States who introduce their drafts under the relevant thematic subject, as that facilitates a more interactive discussion.

In short, the answer to the question posed by the representative of Sri Lanka is that we probably do not yet have all the limited distribution — L documents — as the deadline for submission is tomorrow. To date six of these documents have been issued. That puts u ahead of last year and many years before that. We thu far have issued L.1 through L.6, the last of whic having been requested for today. Draft resolutio A/C.1/61/L.7, on the observance of environmenta norms in the drafting and implementation o agreements on disarmament and arms control, has als been requested for today and should, I hope, be issue by the end of the day.

In addition, we should have four L documents available tomorrow. These deal with the relationship between disarmament and development; United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament the prevention of an arms race in outer space; and the report of the Disarmament Commission. Four additional L documents should be available the day after tomorrow. Provided that we will continue to enjoy the cooperation of delegations and that all drafts will be submitted by 6 p.m. tomorrow, the Committee should have all L documents available, after translation and processing, no later than Wednesday, 18 October.

As to whether we can ascertain in advance which draft resolutions or decisions will be introduced on any given day, we are approached by Member States, as we have requested, which do indicate that they plan to introduce certain drafts and we are grateful to them when they do so. Having said that, it is also the right of Member States to ask for the floor and to introduce additional drafts, without having alerted the Secretariat in advance. That is all I wanted to say at this time; I would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Fernando (Sri Lanka): I wanted to ask the Committee Secretary if he knows whether any draft resolutions will be introduced today. Perhaps with some cooperation between delegations and the Secretariat, we will all be able to work in a cooperative manner. I understand that the Committee Secretary has no control over that matter, but if he could inform us about the drafts that are being introduced, it would make the work from the delegations' side more practical and easy.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): We were informed this morning that two Member States wanted to speak for the purpose of introducing draft resolutions. Those delegations will shortly be given the floor. Malaysia will introduce a draft under agenda item 90 (u), "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the

International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*". Thereafter, the Chair will give the floor to the representative of Brazil to introduce two draft resolutions. One, under agenda item 90 (h), is entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", the second, also under agenda item 90, concerns the 2010 Review Conference of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We were also approached in the course of this afternoon's meeting by the representative of India, who intends to introduce draft resolutions, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" and "Reducing nuclear danger". Finally, Australia has indicated that it will introduce a draft resolution pertaining to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

I hope I have answered all questions correctly and faithfully. There may, as I mentioned, be further introductions to come. I was happy to note that the representative of Sri Lanka also acknowledged the fact that we have no control over Member States in this respect. We very much appreciate the cooperation of delegations on this and other issues.

The Chairperson: I call on the representative of Malaysia to introduce a draft resolution.

Mr. Hamidon (Malaysia): My delegation has the honour to introduce to the Committee, as it has done in past sessions, a draft resolution entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

My delegation expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report, contained in document A/61/127, submitted under agenda item 90 (u) of the sixty-first session of the General Assembly.

My delegation expresses its appreciation to member States that have submitted information pursuant to resolution 60/76.

The advisory opinion on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons rendered by the International Court of Justice on 8 July 1996 remains a historic and resolute decision in the field of nuclear disarmament. The decision of the Court constitutes and remains an authoritative legal call to rid the world of nuclear weapons. The Court's unanimous conclusion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective control is reflected in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

The unanimous decision of the International Court of Justice, while consistent with the solemn obligation of States parties under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, does not confine itself only to those States parties, but is, rather significantly, a universal declaration.

Operative paragraph 2 of the text underlines the obligation of all States to conduct and successfully conclude negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. The decisions of the International Court of Justice must be followed up by concrete action by all Member States.

Aside from retaining those important pronouncements, the text has a necessary modification for technical updating.

The global disarmament and non-proliferation framework remains in flux. Nuclear-weapon States continue to modernize existing nuclear weapons, and large stockpiles of nuclear weapons remain in their arsenals. Several nuclear-weapon States have chosen disengagement, retrogression and unilateral measures rather than multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions.

Those are some of the several fundamental challenges which, if left unchecked, could destabilize international peace and security and increase the risk of new instances of unilateral or pre-emptive use of force. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which underscores the primacy of nuclear disarmament, remains valid today. Member States agreed at that session that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to humankind and to the survival of human civilization.

The goal of nuclear disarmament remains elusive. We must remain committed to achieving that goal. We cannot allow the indefinite perpetuation of the possession of such weapons, nor can we allow the possessive obsession with such weapons to further undermine our goal.

In that connection, my delegation calls on all Member States to commence negotiations leading to complete nuclear disarmament and the unequivocal

undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear weapons. The forthcoming fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will provide us with an opportunity to renew, revitalize and create a new milieu for the further advancement of the global nuclear disarmament process.

The challenges facing the international community in trying to realize a nuclear-weapon-free world have become more formidable than ever, requiring our full and unqualified commitment to the goals we have set ourselves. Recent events are clear testimony to current realities.

My delegation is confident that the draft resolution will continue to receive the support of a large majority of Member States. Furthermore, my delegation is confident that States that support multilateral negotiations will heed the views of the overwhelming majority inside and outside this Committee and the General Assembly, and will join us towards achieving the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

Having presented the draft resolution, let me now convey my Government's response to the nuclear test conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which reads as follows:

> "Malaysia deplores the nuclear test which the Democratic People's Republic of Korea claims to have conducted on 9 October 2006. Malaysia believes that the test is a serious setback to efforts aimed at keeping the region and the world free of nuclear weapons. It could also trigger an arms race in the region. Therefore, Malaysia calls on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to cease developing its capability to produce nuclear weapons and to return to the moratorium on nuclear testing.
>
> "Malaysia strongly believes that the continued existence of nuclear weapons presents a grave threat to humanity, particularly by increasing the risk of proliferation. Malaysia therefore reiterates the importance of achieving the universal goal of complete and general disarmament.
>
> "Malaysia urges all countries in the region to exercise maximum restraint and refrain from actions that could further heighten tension in the region. In that context, Malaysia further urg parties concerned to return to the Six-Party and resume negotiations with a view to res all outstanding issues amicably."

Nuclear disarmament must remain a high p on the global agenda. We must address the issu challenges confronting nuclear disarmament comprehensive, constructive and balanced mann must seek the consensus and political will to forward. Member States must support multi efforts that seek to bring all countries togethe multilateral effort to create a nuclear-free worl vitality of multilateralism and multilaterally solutions in addressing disarmament and interna security issues must be preserved and strengthene

Mr. Duarte (Brazil): Brazil held the pres of the seventh Review Conference of the Parties Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear We (NPT) in 2005, and because of that Brazil is exp following past practice, to present to the G Assembly at its sixty-first session a draft reso calling for the convening of the preparatory proc the 2010 review conference of the parties to the N

Having myself presided over the 2005 Review Conference, it is therefore an honour for formally introduce here the draft resolution e "2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Preparatory Committee", under agenda item "General and complete disarmament".

Informal consultations on the draft reso were held in July and September in New Yor those occasions, delegations exchanged view issues related to the convening of the first Prepa Committee, and in particular the question of the The draft resolution will be submitted by 6 tomorrow, and a copy of the draft resolution ha sent by fax by the mission of Brazil to all missi New York. I trust that the issue of the venue of th Preparatory Committee for the conference w solved in the very near future.

The draft text is essentially of a proc nature. Its importance is earned by the role it pl starting the review process of the Treaty for the review conference. I am sure that this goal w achieved by means of the adoption of the draft the support of all States parties to the Treaty.

Mr. Paranhos (Brazil): It is an honour for me to formally introduce the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", under agenda item 90, "General and complete disarmament".

This is the eleventh consecutive year that a draft resolution on this important matter has been put before the First Committee. Once again, as was the case last year, Brazil is honoured to be joined by New Zealand as initiators of this draft resolution. Adopted as resolution 60/58, this initiative gathered 167 votes in favour at the previous General Assembly session, sustaining the overwhelming majority of votes that has characterized the adoption of such resolutions since 1996. We hope that the present text will enjoy the same broad support. A copy of the draft resolution has been sent by fax to each permanent mission in New York.

This year's draft resolution includes changes relating to the signature of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, which was signed in Kazakhstan on 8 September 2006. We also included reference to the adoption of the Declaration of Santiago de Chile by the Governments of the States members of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean and the States parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, during the nineteenth regular session of the General Conference of the Agency, held in Santiago on 7 and 8 November 2005.

One significant development of the past decade is that in several parts of the world the nuclear option has been ruled out. Nuclear-weapon-free zones have been formally established in Latin America under the Treaty of Tlatelolco and subsequently in the South Pacific with the Treaty of Rarotonga, in South-East Asia with the Treaty of Bangkok and in Africa under the Treaty of Pelindaba. The areas of application of these treaties, with the addition of the Antarctic Treaty, contribute to free from nuclear weapons all peoples of the southern hemisphere as well as of the adjacent areas north of the Equator where those treaties apply.

Our initiative aims at achieving recognition by the General Assembly for the eleventh consecutive year of the progressive emergence of a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas. Such recognition should be considered as a confirmation of the commitment of the international community to non-proliferation and disarmament.

We want to reiterate that, as in previous years, our draft resolution does not create new legal obligations. Neither does it contradict any norm of international law applicable to navigation, such as those contained in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

We call upon States that have not yet done so to move towards ratification of the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties and their protocols. We wish to put on record our appreciation to all those who voted in favour of resolution 60/58 last year. We expect to continue to deserve their support.

Ms. Millar (Australia): As I mentioned this morning, Australia led international action to bring the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the General Assembly, where it was adopted by an overwhelming majority of States in 1996 (see resolution 50/245), so it now gives me great pleasure to introduce the draft resolution on the CTBT to the First Committee at the tenth anniversary of the Treaty's opening for signature.

The text this time is in many ways a technical update on those of previous years, but I would draw the of delegations attention to an important new operative paragraph 5, which condemns the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's announcement of a nuclear weapons test on 9 October 2006.

The draft resolution will be formally issued as document A/C.1/61/L.48 tomorrow, but we have copies at the back of this room for any delegation that would like to look at it now. We would invite those delegations that wish to sponsor the text to please contact the Australian delegation.

While I have the floor, I also want to introduce another draft resolution, on implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and Their Destruction, in Australia's capacity as President of the seventh Meeting of the States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, which was held recently in Geneva. Again, this is a technical update of previous resolutions. Copies are available at the back of this room, and it will be issued as document A/C.1/61/L.47 tomorrow.

Mr. Prasad (India): I am taking the floor to introduce two draft resolutions submitted by India under the cluster on nuclear disarmament. We thought it appropriate to introduce the draft resolutions in

conjunction the thematic debate on the subject. Both of these proposals constitute integral elements of the working paper on nuclear disarmament presented by my delegation during the course of the general debate at the end of last week. While the Secretariat receives the draft resolutions and prints them as documents A/C.1/61/L.51 and L.49 respectively, we have transmitted the two texts to the New York missions of all Member States.

First, on behalf of its sponsors, I would like to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". The draft resolution underlines that the use of nuclear weapons poses the most serious threat to the survival of mankind. At the Non-Aligned Movement Summit held in Havana last month, participating heads of State or Government stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use. The draft resolution reflects the belief of the sponsors that a multilateral, universal and legally binding instrument prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would contribute to the mitigation of the nuclear threat as an important interim measure until we reach agreement on a step-by-step process for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. This will serve to diminish the salience of nuclear weapons in maintaining international security and contribute to changes in doctrines, policies, attitudes and institutions, which are required for a nuclear-weapon-free world. Moreover, a multilateral agreement prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons would strengthen international security and create the right climate for negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The operative part of the draft resolution reiterates the call to the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations to reach agreement on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances. A positive vote for this draft resolution will be a vote by the international community in favour of a decisive step towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

I also have the honour to introduce the draft resolution on reducing nuclear danger. All constituents of the United Nations unanimously agreed in 1978 that nuclear weapons posed the greatest danger to mankind. Member States also agreed that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority. Meanwhile, measures for reducing nuclear danger are necessary for safeguarding our collective security interest.

The draft resolution offers modest and pragmatic proposals for the safety and security of mankind pending the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. First, it calls for a review of nuclear doctrines and for immediate steps to reduce the risk of unintentional or accidental use of nuclear weapons.

The Final Document of the first special session on disarmament (resolution S-10/2) recommended that, to ensure that mankind's survival was not endangered, all States, in particular nuclear-weapon States, should consider various proposals designed to secure the avoidance of the use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war. Strategic experts have identified one or other of the measures proposed in this draft resolution as feasible in the present circumstances, including through de-alerting and de-targeting of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution manifests the conviction of the sponsors that the hair-trigger posture of nuclear forces carries the unacceptable risk of unintentional or accidental use of these weapons, which could have catastrophic consequences. The threat posed by the increased risk of nuclear weapons or their components falling into the hands of non-State actors, including terrorists, has further aggravated existing dangers.

While unilateral, bilateral or plurilateral nuclear confidence-building measures are useful, our aim is to reach international understanding or agreements for reducing nuclear danger, and also the risk of accidental nuclear war. A positive vote for this draft resolution will be a reaffirmation by the international community of the need to take decisive steps towards reducing nuclear danger.

The Chairperson: One delegation has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind members that the number of interventions in exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting shall be limited to two per item. The first intervention in exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting shall be limited to 10 minutes, and the second intervention shall be limited to five minutes.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. Kim Kwang Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The Democratic People's Republic of Korea rejects categorically the fuss that some countries, including the United States and Japan, have made about our nuclear test and have urged us to abandon the nuclear programme.

In this regard, my delegation wishes to reiterate parts of the statement about the nuclear test issued by the Foreign Ministry of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, so that delegations in this Committee will have a better understanding of the issue.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea officially announced that it had manufactured up-to-date nuclear weapons after going through transparent, legitimate processes to cope with the escalated United States threat of nuclear war and sanctions and pressure.

The already declared possession of nuclear weapons presupposes the nuclear test. The extreme United States threat of a nuclear war and sanctions and pressure compelled the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to conduct a nuclear test, an essential process for bolstering nuclear deterrence as a corresponding measure for defence.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will never use nuclear weapons first, but strictly prohibits any threat of nuclear weapons and nuclear transfer. A people without a reliable war deterrent are bound to meet a tragic death, and the sovereignty of their country is bound to be wantonly infringed upon. This is a bitter lesson taught by the bloodshed resulting from the law of the jungle in different parts of the world.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear weapons will serve as a reliable war deterrent for protecting the supreme interests of the State and the security of the Korean nation from the United States threat of aggression, averting a new war and firmly safeguarding peace and stability on the Korean peninsula under all circumstances.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will always sincerely implement its international commitment in the field of nuclear non-proliferation as a responsible nuclear-weapon State. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will do its utmost to realize the denuclearization of the peninsula and to give impetus to worldwide nuclear disarmament and the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

As the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been exposed to the United States nuclear threat and blackmail over the past more than half a century, it proposed the denuclearization of the peninsula before any others, and has since, has made utmost efforts to that end. The United States, however, has abused the idea of denuclearization set out by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for isolating and stifling the ideology and the system chosen by its people, while systematically disregarding all of its magnanimity and sincerity.

The ultimate goal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is not denuclearization to be followed by its unilateral disarmament, but the goal of settling the hostile relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States and removing the very source of all nuclear threats from the Korean peninsula and its vicinity.

There is no change in the principled stand of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to materialize the denuclearization of the peninsula through dialogue and negotiation. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will make positive efforts to denuclearize the peninsula in its own way, without fail, despite all challenges and difficulties.

The Chairperson: Before adjourning the meeting, allow me once again to remind all delegations that the deadline for submission of draft resolutions is tomorrow, 11 October, at 6 p.m. Delegations are urged to adhere to that deadline so that the Secretariat can process the documents in a timely manner.

Tomorrow, at 3 p.m. sharp, the Committee will be having a thematic discussion on the issues of other weapons of mass destruction and of the disarmament aspects of outer space. We will also have a guest speaker, the President-designate of the Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.